



United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,824	09/29/2000	Dan Sanchez	155695-0112	9740
75	90 02/21/2003			
	RELL & MANELLA LLP		EXAMINER	
840 Newport Center Drive Suite 400 Newport Beach, CA 92660			DOERRLER, WILLIAM CHARLES	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3744	
			DATE MAILED: 02/21/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A Compliance of the Compliance
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/675,824	SANCHEZ ET AL.
, and a second	Examiner	Art Unit
	William C Doerrler	3744
The MAILING DATE of this communica		
HE REPLY FILED 27 January 2003 FAILS To herefore, further action by the applicant is requal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR	either: (1) a timely filed amendm of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3	ent which places the application in
	FOR REPLY [check either a) or	b)]
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the ma	ailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date event, however, will the statutory period for reply exported for reply exponents. The First RI 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136 are been filed is the date for purposes of determining the per 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the part of the characteristic forms.	kpire later than SIX MONTHS from the mail EPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH (a). The date on which the petition under 3 (riod of extension and the corresponding amove shortened statutory period for reply origin	7 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee bunt of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under ally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
o) above, it checked. Any reply received by the Office fater to arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ian three months after the maining date of the	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
A Notice of Appeal was filed on A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension there	Appellant's Brief must be filed witl of (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dis	nin the period set forth in smissal of the appeal.
. The proposed amendment(s) will not be	entered because:	
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would rec	uire further consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (s	see Note below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the apsissues for appeal; and/or		
(d) they present additional claims with	out canceling a corresponding nur	mber of finally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
. Applicant's reply has overcome the follow	wing rejection(s):	
1. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	would be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely filed amendment
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ application in condition for allowance be	request for reconsideration has because:	een considered but does NOT place the
5. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be cons raised by the Examiner in the final reject	tion.	•
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed an explanation of how the new or amended	mendment(s) a) will not be ento I claims would be rejected is prov	ered or b)⊠ will be entered and an ided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be)	as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4-12 and 14-20</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	·	_
3. The proposed drawing correction filed o	n is a) approved or b)[disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosur	e Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Pape	r No(s)
10. Other:		William C Doerrier Primary Examiner
		Art Unit: 3744

While Jackson does not state that the clamp can be used in a medical environment, this is seen as irrelevant. Applicant's basic inventive concept is a linkage. If the same structure was used by an auto mechanic or any other user for the same purpose, (to restrict the movement of parts), the teaching is still seen to apply. The intended use of a heart stabilizer does not effect the use of the spring one way or the other. If the tension on the heart was seen to provide importance, this could be given patentable weight. However, in the eyes of the examiner, the adjustable spring is used in part of a linkage and the heart stabilizer attached to one end of the linkage is not seen to refute the teaching of Jackson that spring clamps can be ginen adjustable spring forces.

200